$_{ m JS~44~(Rev.~06/17)}$ Case 2:20-cv-03247-MCA-LPW-Pocument Stilled 03/25/20 Page 1 of 7 PageID: 1

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES) (c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)			County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED. Attorneys (If Known)		
□ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	☐ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)		(For Diversity Cases Only)	TF DEF 1 □ 1 Incorporated <i>or</i> Pri of Business In T	and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF ncipal Place
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)			2	Another State
			Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3 🗖 3 Foreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT			EODEEITHDE/DENALTV	Click here for: Nature of BANKRUPTCY	of Suit Code Descriptions.
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 240 Torts to Land □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS 440 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting 442 Employment 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other 448 Education 44	PERSONAL INJURY 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability Pharmaceutical Personal Injury product Liability Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPER 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage 785 Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITION Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & Othe 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement	of Property 21 USC 881 690 Other LABOR 710 Fair Labor Standards Act 720 Labor/Management Relations 740 Railway Labor Act 751 Family and Medical Leave Act 1790 Other Labor Litigation 791 Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION 462 Naturalization Application	□ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 □ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS □ 820 Copyrights □ 830 Patent □ 835 Patent - Abbreviated New Drug Application □ 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY □ 861 HIA (1395ff) □ 862 Black Lung (923) □ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) □ 864 SSID Title XVI □ 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS □ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) □ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	OTHER STATUTES □ 375 False Claims Act 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a)) □ 400 State Reapportionment □ 410 Antitrust □ 430 Banks and Banking □ 450 Commerce □ 460 Deportation □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations □ 480 Consumer Credit □ 490 Cable/Sat TV □ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange □ 890 Other Statutory Actions □ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 893 Environmental Matters □ 895 Freedom of Information Act □ 896 Arbitration □ 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision □ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
	moved from 3	Remanded from Appellate Court	☐ 4 Reinstated or ☐ 5 Transfer Anothe (specify,	er District Litigation	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO			re filing (Do not cite jurisdictional stat	,	
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	UNDER RULE 2	IS A CLASS ACTION 3, F.R.Cv.P.	DEMAND \$	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND:	if demanded in complaint:
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER	
DATE		SIGNATURE OF ATT	FORNEY OF RECORD		
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY					
RECEIPT # AM	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP	JUDGE	MAG. JUD	GE

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

DANIELLE M. PRIETO, :

CIVIL ACTION

Plaintiff,

NO.

v. :

:

LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY

OF NORTH AMERICA,

•

Defendant.

CIVIL ACTION COMPLAINT

Plaintiff, DANIELLE M. PRIETO, by and through her attorney, Linda M. Lopez, Esq. of the Law Offices of Eric A. Shore, P.C., as and for her Complaint against Defendant, LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY OF NORTH AMERICA, hereby avers as follows:

PARTIES

- 1. Plaintiff, DANIELLE M. PRIETO, (hereinafter "Plaintiff") was and still is a citizen and resident of the State of New Jersey, residing at 186 Hartshron Drive, Short Hills, New Jersey 07078.
- 2. Defendant, LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY OF NORTH AMERICA, (hereinafter "Defendant") has offices located at 900 Cottage Grove Road, Bloomfield, Connecticut 06002.

JURISDICTION

3. Jurisdiction of the Court is based upon 29 U.S.C. §§ 1132(e)(1) and 1132(f), which give the District Courts jurisdiction to hear civil actions brought to recover benefits due under the terms of an employee welfare benefit plan. Jurisdiction is also founded on 28 U.S.C. §

- 1331 because this action arises under 29 U.S.C. § 1001 et. seq. (Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, hereinafter "ERISA").
- 4. Venue in the District of New Jersey is appropriate because Defendant conducts business and is subject to personal jurisdiction in the judicial district and maintains contacts in the judicial district sufficient to subject it to personal jurisdiction.
- 5. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(a)(1) and § 1391(c), this action is properly venued in the District of New Jersey.

FACTS

- 6. At all times hereinafter mentioned, Plaintiff was employed as a Managing Director of Fixed Income Derivative Sales for BNP Paribas US Wholesale Holdings, Corp. ("BNP Paribas"), and at all times was a participant and/or beneficiary under the Long Term Disability ("LTD") plan.
- 7. Plaintiff had a strong work history working for BNP Paribas prior to filing for LTD insurance benefits.
- 8. The LTD plan is an employee welfare benefit plan specifically covered under ERISA, 29 U.S.C. § 1002(2)(A).
- 9. At all times material herein, Defendant made and/or participated in making all benefits decisions under the LTD plan.
- 10. During Plaintiff's employment with BNP Paribas, Defendant issued a long term group disability income policy (hereinafter the "Policy").
- 11. At all times hereinafter mentioned, said Policy of insurance was issued for the benefit of certain eligible employees in exchange for the payment of premiums by BNP Paribas and/or its employees.

- 12. At all times mentioned herein, Plaintiff was and is an employee eligible for long term disability benefits as an insured under the Policy.
- 13. Said Policy provided, among other things, that long term disability insurance benefit payments will be made to Plaintiff in the event that she becomes disabled as a result of injury or sickness.
 - 14. Plaintiff stopped working on or about August 29, 2017.
- 15. Plaintiff applied for and collected LTD insurance benefits through April 30, 2019.
- 16. Defendant notified Plaintiff that her LTD benefits would be discontinued as of April 30, 2019, and that denial was affirmed by Defendant by letter dated June 28, 2019.
- 17. On July 24, 2019, Plaintiff submitted a written appeal of that adverse determination.
- 18. On November 20, 2019, Defendant issued a final administrative denial of Plaintiff's claim for continuing LTD benefits.
- 19. As of April 30, 2019, Plaintiff's LTD coverage was in full force and effect and Plaintiff was an eligible employee.
- 20. From April 30, 2019 to the present, Plaintiff has been disabled within the meaning and pursuant to the terms of her Policy coverage as she is unable to perform, on a sustained basis, either her own or any reasonable occupation, as that term is defined in the subject Policy.
- 21. Plaintiff's disability is caused by complications and impairments of thoracic outlet syndrome, complex regional pain syndrome of right upper extremity, multi-level cervical spine fusion, cervical spinal stenosis, neural foraminal stenosis, cervical radiculopathy, cervical spondylolisthesis, degenerative disc disease, right elbow ulnar nerve transport, brachial plexus

neurolysis, right cubital tunnel syndrome, torn labrum, multiple rib resections, post-concussion syndrome, occipital neuralgia, recurring shingles, high blood pressure, insomnia, all of which cause symptoms of chronic pain, recurring headaches, loss of bladder control, cognitive difficulties, difficulty with focus and concentration, memory loss, and lack of retention.

- 22. Plaintiff cooperated with the Defendant in all respects, provided proper proof of loss in support of her claim, and otherwise complied with the terms and conditions of the Policy regarding the filing and maintenance of the claim.
- 23. Pursuant to the Policy, Defendant has been obligated to continue the periodic payment of monthly long term disability benefits to Plaintiff since April 30, 2019.
- 24. Despite Plaintiff's continued total disability, Defendant has denied continuing LTD insurance benefit payments to Plaintiff beyond April 30, 2019 and continues to refuse to pay benefits pursuant to the Policy, although payment thereof has been duly demanded.
- 25. Said refusal on the part of the Defendant is a willful and wrongful breach of the Policy's terms and conditions.
- 26. Defendant afforded little weight to the opinions of Plaintiff's treating physicians who clearly opined that she has been unable to work since April 30, 2019, due to her disabling conditions and complications from her impairments and medical conditions.
- 27. Defendant's denial of Plaintiff's disability insurance benefits is unreasonable and unsupported by substantial evidence and, as such, constitutes a breach of fiduciary duty.
- 28. Defendant's unreasonable and unsupported denial of Plaintiff's disability insurance benefits is evidenced by the number of procedural irregularities in its claim handling, including but not limited to: the failure to consider the impact of Plaintiff's physical and mental conditions and limitations on her ability to perform all of the essential duties of her regular

occupation or any occupation; the refusal to consider Plaintiff's credible subjective complaints about her inability to work; the reliance upon a selective review of medical records to reach a result oriented claim determination; the failure to utilize appropriately qualified and unbiased medical personnel to reach decisions and/or render opinions on levels of impairment; the biased and flawed vocational consideration on Plaintiff's claim; the failure to perform a fair and neutral evaluation of Plaintiff's medical condition and associated restrictions and limitations; and other biased claim handling.

- 29. Defendant's claim handling resulted in numerous violations of 29 C.F.R. § 2560.503-1 et. seq.
- 30. Defendant's claim handling failed to provide Plaintiff with a full and fair review of her claim.
- 31. Defendant's claim handling demonstrates a bias against Plaintiff's claim due to its impact on Defendant's financial situation and frustrated Plaintiff from receiving a full and fair review of her claim.
- 32. Plaintiff has attempted to exhaust all administrative appeals and remedies to the extent they exist pursuant to the conditions of the employee benefit plan.
- 33. By reason of the foregoing claims conduct, Defendant failed, by operation of law, to establish and follow reasonable claims procedures that would yield a decision on the merits of her claim pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 2560.503(1).
- 34. Because Defendant failed to satisfy the minimal procedural safeguards set forth in 29 C.F.R. § 2560.503(1), Defendant's adverse benefit determination is not entitled to any judicial deference.
 - 35. Defendant willfully failed to comply with ERISA regulations.

36. Monthly disability insurance benefit payments to Plaintiff are continuing to be

due and payable by Defendant with the passage of each month.

37. Plaintiff is entitled to receive the total life-time benefit of the plan discounted to

present value, due to Defendant's arbitrary and capricious decision to deny Plaintiff's benefits.

38. Plaintiff is entitled to receive, in addition to the benefits due under the plan of

insurance, reimbursement for reasonable attorney's fees and costs of this action pursuant to 29

U.S.C. 1132(g).

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, Danielle M. Prieto, demands judgment in her favor and

against Defendant together for:

A. Payment of all benefits in arrears due and owing since the denial of benefits, plus

interest;

B. The total lifetime benefit under the plan discounted to present value;

C. Attorneys' fees and costs of suit;

D. Interest and delay damages; and,

E. Any other further relief this Court deems just proper and equitable.

By:

s/ Linda M. Lopez

Linda M. Lopez, Esq.

Attorney I.D. No. 017592006

THE LAW OFFICES OF ERIC A. SHORE

1500 JFK Blvd, Suite 1240

Philadelphia, PA 19102

(215) 627-9999

Attorney for Plaintiff, Danielle M. Prieto

Date: March 25, 2020